

# SENATE RECORD VOTE ANALYSIS

104th Congress  
1st Session

**Vote No. 205**

May 25, 1995, 9:48 a.m.  
Page S-7409 Temp. Record

## BUDGET RESOLUTION/\$2 Billion Defense Cut for Domestic Spending

**SUBJECT:** Senate Concurrent Budget Resolution for fiscal years 1996-2002 . . . S. Con. Res. 13. Lautenberg amendment No. 1169.

**ACTION: AMENDMENT REJECTED, 26-73**

**SYNOPSIS:** As reported, S. Con. Res. 13, the fiscal year 1996 Concurrent Budget Resolution, will reduce projected spending over 7 years to balance the budget by fiscal year (FY) 2002 without increasing taxes. Savings that will accrue from lower debt service payments (an estimated \$170 billion) will be dedicated to a reserve fund, which may be used for tax reductions after enactment of laws to ensure a balanced budget. Highlights include the following: the rate of growth in Medicare will be slowed to 7.1 percent; Medicaid's rate of growth will be slowed to 5 percent and it will be transformed into a block grant program; the Commerce Department and more than 100 other Federal programs, agencies, and commissions will be eliminated; welfare and housing programs will be reformed; agriculture, energy, and transportation subsidies will be cut; foreign aid will be cut; defense spending will be cut and then allowed to increase back to its 1995 level; and Social Security will not be altered.

**The Lautenberg amendment** would reduce defense spending by \$2 billion and would increase nondefense spending by the same amount, with the stated intent of cutting "wasteful bureaucratic overhead and wasteful procurement" in the defense budget and increasing spending on efforts to combat domestic violence.

The amendment was offered after all debate time had expired. However, some statements on amendments were added to the record or were made before the amendments were offered and before debate time had expired. Also, by unanimous consent, 1 minute of time was allowed on each amendment for explanatory statements before each vote.

**Those favoring** the amendment contended:

The Lautenberg amendment would cut \$2 billion in wasteful Defense Department spending and would use the savings to fight domestic violence. Every 12 seconds, a woman is battered in the United States. Domestic violence is reaching crisis proportions. We know our colleagues are determined to reestablish the 60-vote firewall between defense and domestic discretionary spending,

(See other side)

YEAS (26)		NAYS (73)			NOT VOTING (1)	
Republicans (2 or 4%)	Democrats (24 or 53%)	Republicans (52 or 96%)	Democrats (21 or 47%)	Republicans (0)	Democrats (1)	
Hatfield	Akaka	Abraham	Hutchison	Baucus		
Jeffords	Biden	Ashcroft	Inhofe	Bingaman	Mikulski- <sup>2</sup>	
	Boxer	Bennett	Kassebaum	Breaux		
	Bradley	Bond	Kempthorne	Bryan		
	Daschle	Brown	Kyl	Bumpers		
	Dodd	Burns	Lott	Byrd		
	Feingold	Campbell	Lugar	Conrad		
	Feinstein	Chafee	Mack	Dorgan		
	Harkin	Coats	McCain	Exon		
	Kennedy	Cochran	McConnell	Ford		
	Kerry	Cohen	Murkowski	Glenn		
	Kohl	Coverdell	Nickles	Graham		
	Lautenberg	Craig	Packwood	Heflin		
	Leahy	D'Amato	Pressler	Hollings		
	Levin	DeWine	Roth	Inouye		
	Moseley-Braun	Dole	Santorum	Johnston		
	Moynihan	Domenici	Shelby	Kerrey		<b>EXPLANATION OF ABSENCE:</b>
	Murray	Faircloth	Simpson	Lieberman		1—Official Business
	Pell	Frist	Smith	Nunn		2—Necessarily Absent
	Reid	Gorton	Snowe	Pryor		3—Illness
	Rockefeller	Gramm	Specter	Robb		4—Other
	Sarbanes	Grams	Stevens			
	Simon	Grassley	Thomas			<b>SYMBOLS:</b>
	Wellstone	Gregg	Thompson			AY—Announced Yea
		Hatch	Thurmond			AN—Announced Nay
		Helms	Warner			PY—Paired Yea
						PN—Paired Nay

but surely they can agree to this reasonable exception.

**Those opposing** the amendment contended:

The Lautenberg amendment would cut defense spending by another \$2 billion; how that \$2 billion would then be spent is an open question. Senators may think that this amendment would cut "wasteful" defense spending to pay for domestic violence programs, but all it would do is cut \$2 billion from defense, wasteful or not, to be spent on domestic programs. We oppose using the defense budget as a piggybank. If Senators wish to budget a greater percentage of the domestic discretionary budget to combat domestic violence, we will happily support them, but we will not join them in any effort, for any reason, to further gut the defenses of this Nation.